



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,583	07/29/2003	Yannis Labrou	1634.1005	4123
21171	7590	03/16/2009	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			WORJLOH, JALATIE	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3685	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/16/2009	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/628,583

**Applicant(s)**

LABROU ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jalatee Worjloh

**Art Unit**

3685

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6,8-21 and 23-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6,8-21 and 23-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-31-08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed December 24, 2008.
2. Claims 6, 8-21, and 23-31 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicants' arguments filed December 31, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. As per the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 6, 8-21 and 23-31, Applicants directed the Examiner to paragraph 487 and Fig. 31; however, these sections do not show a first view of the agreement or the second view of the agreement. Also, these sections do not show deriving the key. Applicant states that the consumer message is the first view of the agreement and the merchant message is the second view. However, the specification does not express this relationship. Also, the specification discusses the consumer generating a token certificate (see at least paragraphs [00211] -[00217], is this the first view?
5. All other arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 6, 8-21, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. That is, these claims are considered hybrid claims. See MPEP §2173.05(p) II.

In particular, the claims are directed to neither a "process" or a "machine" but rather embrace or overlap two different statutory classes of invention as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §101.. For example, claim 10 recites "A system." In light of this evidence, one of ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret these recitations as express intent by Applicant(s) to claim a product claim. Alternatively, claim 10 also recites "the STS stores". One of ordinary skill in the art could also reasonably interpret these recitations as express intent by Applicant(s) to claim a process claim. In light of this conflicting evidence, a person of ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret claim 10 to be drawn to both a product or process.

Therefore in accordance with §2173.05(p) II which states that a single claim must be drawn to either a product or process (but not both) and because a potential competitor of Applicant(s) would not know whether *possession alone* of the claimed structure constituted infringement, or alternatively, if infringement required the *execution* of the recited method steps, the claims are indefinite. If Applicant(s) overcome this particular 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection, the related 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection will also be withdrawn. For examination purposes, the Examiner will interpret claims 11-20 as claims directed to a process only.

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 6, 8-21, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, at least claim 10 recites “a first view of the agreement and securing the *first view* of the agreement based upon a *key derived* from both a first mobile device parameter stored in the mobile device and input personal identifying information...the first view of the agreement not including the first and second mobile device parameters”; however, the specification does not provide support for these features. Applicants directed the Examiner to paragraph 487, but this paragraph does not clearly describe these features.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 6, 8-21, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

35 USC 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a “new and useful process, machine, manufacture, *or* composition of matter, *or* any new and useful improvement thereof” (emphasis added). The applicants claims mentioned above are intended to embrace or overlap *two* different statutory classes of invention as set forth in 35 USC 101. The claims begin by discussing a system, but subsequently the claims then deal with the specifics of a method (the steps) executed by the processing means (see above rejection of claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for specific details regarding this issue). “A claim of this type is precluded by

the express language of 35 USC 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only", Ex parte Lyell (17 USPQ2d 1548).

### ***Double Patenting***

12. Claim 10 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7349871. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 7349871 discloses all the features of claim 10 except the concept of using a key to secure the view. Since the claim recited in U.S. Patent No. 7349871 and the present invention performs a similar function, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the present invention by removing the additional element resulting essentially in the same invention. It is well settled that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. *In re Karison*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969). Thus, omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 8-10 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6163771 to Walker et al. ("Walker") and US Patent No. 6098053 to Slater in view of US Publication No. 2003/0226030 to Hurst et al. ("Hurst").

Referring to claim 10, Walker discloses a first party mobile device comprising a computer processor that executes operations of generating, independently of second and third parties, a first view of the agreement and securing the first view of the agreement based upon a key derived from both a first mobile device parameter stored in the mobile device and input personal identifying information of the first party as second input mobile device parameter input to the mobile device and transmitting the first view of the agreement to the second party, the first view of the agreement not including the first and second mobile device parameters (see fig. 3B, items 360 and 361; see col. 6, lines 15-39; 61-67), a second party merchant device comprising a computer processor that executes operations of generating, independently of the first and third party, a second view of the agreement secured based upon both a first merchant information and transmitting the second secured view of the agreement to the third party (see Fig. 3B, item 362; col. 6, lines 39-43 and col. 11, lines 8-18), wherein the first party mobile device and the second party merchant device are in communication over an open and non-secure wireless network for connecting the first party and the second party and transmitting the first view of the agreement from the first party to the second party, wherein the second party merchant device is in communication with the trusted third party server over a wired or wireless network for connecting the second party to the third party and transmitting the first and second views of the agreement to the trusted third party server (see Fig. 3A and related text), wherein the agreement pertains to ordering and/or purchasing goods and/or services, and the first party mobile device is

operated by a consumer, the second party merchant device is operation by a merchant, and the third party is a Secure Transaction Server (STS), wherein only the STS stores the personal identifying information of the first party as the second input mobile device parameter (see figures 3B, 5 and related text). Walker does not expressly disclose the second view of the agreement is secured based upon both a first merchant device parameter and a second device parameter, wherein the trusted third party server comprises a computer processor that executes operations of verifying conditions of the agreement including identities of the first and second parties in the independent secured first and second views of the agreement, based upon a symmetric agreement verification protocol deriving the key based on upon the first and second mobile device parameters for the secured first view and using the first and second merchant device parameters for the secured second view, and taking action executing the agreement according to the verification of the conditions of the agreement. Slater discloses a second view of the agreement is secured based upon both a first merchant device parameter and a second device parameter (see col. 9, lines 13-47 and 60-64 - The merchant receives the instructions and appends merchant payment instructions to the purchasers payment instructions to form financial transaction instructions and sends the financial transaction instructions to the financial institution), a trusted third party server that verifies conditions of the agreement including identities of the first and second parties in the independent secured first and second views of the agreement, based on a symmetric agreement verification protocol using the first and second mobile device parameters for the secured first view and first and second merchant device parameters for the secured second view, and takes action executing the agreement according to the verification of the conditions of the agreement, wherein the agreement pertains to ordering



and/or purchasing goods and/or services, and the first party mobile device is operated by a consumer, the second party merchant device is operation by a merchant and the third party is a secure transaction server (STS), and wherein the personal identifying information of the first party is consumer identifying information as the input second mobile device parameter stored only by the trusted secure transaction server and for authorization, the consumer inputs the consumer identifying information into the consumer mobile device by the trusted secure transaction server (see col. 8, lines 10-16 - symmetric encryption method is applied by the financial institution & col. 9, lines 65-67 and col. 10, lines 1-67 – the financial institution validates the financial transaction instructions, as well as insuring that purchase order information, purchaser's and merchant's transaction amount and other information utilized in performing the transaction is in agreement between the parties. If the verification is successful, the financial institution sends an authorization message to the merchant and credits the merchant while debiting the purchaser). The sole difference between Slater and the claimed subject matter is that Slater does not expressly disclose a key based upon a first mobile device parameter stored in the mobile device and personal identifying information of the first party and deriving the key based upon the first and second mobile device parameters. Slater utilizes symmetric encryption method [which uses a key] to generate a secured view and the claim recites the key being generated based on the mobile parameter and personal identifying information. Hurst discloses using mobile device parameters to generate a key (see claims 7 & 23), which shows that generation of key based on mobile parameters was known in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, substituting the encryption method taught by Slater with the method Hurst is

obvious. The simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable results renders the claim obvious.

As per claims 8, 9, and 14-19, see claim 10 rejection above.

15. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Slater and Hurst as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6470448 to Kuroda et al. ("Kuroda").

Referring to claim 11, Walker discloses the trusted secure transaction server (see claim 10 above). Slater does not expressly disclose the transaction server supplies a token as confirmation of the payment. Kuroda discloses the transaction server supplies a token as confirmation of the payment (see col. 7, lines 19-24). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Walker to allow the secure transaction server to supply a token as confirmation of the payment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it ensures the parties that the transaction is complete.

Referring to claim 13, Walker in view of Slater and Hurst discloses the system wherein only the trusted secure transaction server, and neither the merchant device nor the consumer mobile device are able to observe details of other's transaction including the identifying information of the consumer and the merchant ( see claim 10 above and notice in Slater notice, the purchaser instructions and merchant instructions are encrypted. The merchant can not read the security information of the purchaser and the purchaser does not have an opportunity to read the merchant instruction because the information is sent directly to the financial institution).

16. Claims 6, 12, 20, 21, 23 -25, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Slater, Hurst, and Kuroda as applied to claims 11 and 18 above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2001/0037264 to Husemann.

Referring to claim 12, Walker discloses the trusted secure transaction server (see claim 10 above). Walker does not expressly disclose the merchant device processes the token presented by the consumer to consume the goods and/or service. Husemann discloses the merchant device processes the token presented by the consumer to consume the goods and/or service (see paragraph [0085]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Walker to include the merchant device processes the token presented by the consumer to consume the goods and/or service. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it allows the customer to confirm the order with the merchant (see paragraph [0085] of Husemann).

Referring to claims 6 and 20, Walker discloses the system wherein the wired or wireless network connecting the merchant device with the secure transaction server is a secure network and an open and non-secure wireless network (see claim 18 above). Walker does not expressly disclose a wireless local area network operated by the merchant device. Husemann discloses a wireless local area network operated by the merchant device (see paragraph [0100], [0035] and fig. 5). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Walker to include disclose a wireless local area network operated by the merchant device. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because LANs are capable of transmitting data at very fast rates.

Referring to claims 21 and 23, Walker discloses the system wherein the wired or wireless network connecting the merchant device with the secure transaction server is a secure network and an open and non-secure wireless network (see claim 18 above). Walker does not expressly disclose the wireless local area network includes a hotspot accessible by a plurality of merchant devices and consumer mobile devices and the consumer mobile device provides selectable merchants based upon the merchant devices through the wireless local area network. Husemann teaches a local area network operated by the merchant (see claim 20 above). The Examiner notes that modifying the network taught by Husemann to include a hotspot is obvious because it is well known in the art of networking to include hotspot in specific geographic location as an access point for wireless LAN. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Slater to include the wireless local area network includes a hotspot accessible by a plurality of merchant devices and consumer mobile devices and the consumer mobile device provides selectable merchants based upon the merchant devices through the wireless local area network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides public wireless broadband network services to mobile visitors in heavily populated places and has a short range of access.

As per claim 24, see claims 10 and 20 above.

Referring to claim 25, Walker discloses a network (see claim 19 above). Walker does not expressly disclose the merchant device is connected to the secure transaction server via Internet using security including a secure socket layer (SSL) or Virtual Private Network. Kudora discloses the merchant device is connected to the secure transaction server via Internet using security including a secure socket layer (SSL) or Virtual Private Network ( see paragraphs

[0029] & [115]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Walker to include the merchant device is connected to the secure transaction server via Internet using security including a secure socket layer (SSL) or Virtual Private Network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it allows global users to share data in a private manner.

Referring to claim 29, Walker discloses the consumer and merchant devices (see claim 18 above). Slater does not expressly disclose wherein one of the services for the purchase is a movie ticket, from the merchant device and wherein the receipt is an electronic token as proof of the payment and wherein the consumer mobile device provides the token to obtain the service, including a paperless e-ticket. Husemann discloses wherein one of the services for the purchase is a movie ticket, from the merchant device and wherein the receipt is an electronic token as proof of the payment and wherein the consumer mobile device provides the token to obtain the service, including a paperless e-ticket (see paragraphs [0075] –[0078]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Walker to include one of the services for the purchase is a movie ticket, from the merchant device and wherein the receipt is an electronic token as proof of the payment and wherein the consumer mobile device provides the token to obtain the service, including a paperless e-ticket. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this it allows quick transactions to occur (see paragraph [0078] of Husemann - all of this can be done within minutes or even seconds).

As claim 26, see claim 25 above.

Referring to claim 31, Walker discloses the secure transaction server (see claim 18 above). Walker does not expressly disclose the server provides ancillary information from the payment services, including advertisements, special interest rate for a particular purchase if a specific credit account is chosen for a attempted purchase, to the consumer mobile device in response messages prior to the payment authorization. Husemann teaches the server provides ancillary information from the payment services, including advertisements, special interest rate for a particular purchase if a specific credit account is chosen for a attempted purchase, to the consumer mobile device in response messages prior to the payment authorization (see paragraphs [0099] & [0078] – encryption information of the online bill is interpreted as ancillary information sent along with the online bill). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose Slater to include the server provides ancillary information from the payment services, including advertisements, special interest rate for a particular purchase if a specific credit account is chosen for a attempted purchase, to the consumer mobile device in response messages prior to the payment authorization. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it ensures that the material in the electronic document is only viewed by the authorized party (see Husemann paragraph [0078]).

17. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Slater and Hurst as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5465328 to Dievondorff.

Walker discloses the consumer mobile device and the secure transaction server (see claim 18 above). Walker does not expressly disclose the consumer mobile devices request the secure

transaction server to disable the consumer mobile device for a purchase using a current consumer identifying information. Dievondorff discloses disclose the consumer mobile devices request the secure transaction server to disable the consumer mobile device for a purchase using a current consumer identifying information, wherein the secure transaction server detects and disables a consumer account if there are multiple attempts to authorize a payment with incorrect consumer identifying information (see col. 7, lines 56-66). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Walker to include the consumer mobile devices request the secure transaction server to disable the consumer mobile device for a purchase using a current consumer identifying information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it prevents unauthorized individuals from accessing utilizing the device.

18. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Slater , and Hurst as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2001/0034670 to Blair.

Walker discloses purchase of goods and/or services (see claim 18 above). Walker does not expressly disclose the purchase is a return of goods and/or services from the consumer to the merchant and the secure transaction server causes payment from the merchant to the consumer. Blair discloses the purchase is a return of goods and/or services from the consumer to the merchant and the secure transaction server causes payment from the merchant to the consumer (see paragraph [0024]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Slater to include the purchase is a return of goods and/or services from the consumer to the merchant and the secure transaction

server causes payment from the merchant to the consumer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides the customer with satisfaction causing them to do business with the entity again (see paragraph [0024]).

### ***Conclusion***

19. The claim recites the functional language for. Applicant is reminded that functional recitation(s) using the word “for” or other functional language have been considered but given less patentable weight because they fail to add any steps and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in additional steps. See *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1368, 1375-76, 58 USPQ2d 1508, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (Where the language in a method claim states only a purpose and intended result, the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim.).

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US Patent No. 7200749 to Wheeler et al. discloses a method and system for using electronic communications for an electronic contract.
- US Patent No. 5956404 to Schneier et al. discloses digitally signing a message by a tamper resistant device to generate a digital signature.
- US Patent No. 6598032 to Challenger et al. discloses a secure PIN entry device.
- U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037254 to Glikman discloses a system and method for assisting a customer in purchasing commodity using a mobile device.



- US Patent No. 5794207 to Walker et al. discloses a method and apparatus for effectuating bilateral buyer-driven commerce.

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 571-272-6714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt II can be reached on 571-272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jalatee Worjloh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3685